REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 1, 2008. Claims 7 , 8, 11, 12, 14, 16 to 20 and 22 to 25 are pending in the application, of which Claims 7, 12, 17 to 20, 24 and 25 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 11, 12, 17 to 20 and 22 to 25 were objected to for various informalities. Without conceding the correctness of the objections, Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 14 to clarify that it is directed to a computer-readable storage medium. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 12, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,400 (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,405 (Aschenbrenner). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Patent No. 6,525,721 (Thomas). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0105661 (Nishida). Claims 19 and 22 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0118380 (Krueger). Claims 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Krueger and Thomas. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 12, 14, 17 and 18

Claim 7 is directed to a resource processing method for downloading resources to a device having a printing function. The method comprises a decision step of determining processing of a resource, which is downloadable to a device, in dependence upon the resource to be downloaded to the device and a changeover step of changing over to processing of the resource based upon a result of a decision made in said decision step, wherein, if the resource is a font or form, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a font or form designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or form stored in the device and not designated by the user, or, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a color profile designated by the user and not stored in the device without deleting a color profile stored in the device and not designated by the user.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Sasaki and Aschenbrenner, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the method of Claim 7. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of, during a changeover of a resource, if the resource is a font or form, the processing of this resource is changed over to processing for adding on a font or form designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or form stored in the device and not designated by the user, or, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a color profile designated by the user and not stored in the device without deleting a color profile stored in the device and not designated by the user.

In the Office Action, it is admitted that Sasaki fails to disclose adding and deleting resources based on whether or not the resource is a font, a form or a color profile.

However, the Office Action cites Aschenbrenner as disclosing such a function. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such a characterization of Aschenbrenner.

In contrast to the present invention, Aschenbrenner discloses that "(h)igh-speed color printing is enabled by managing complex resources in a way that ensures resources are present in the device when they are required by an AFP page. Two conceptual methods are provided in a printer for holding downloaded resources: caching and capturing. Whenever a resource is downloaded from the print server to the printer, it is cached. This means that the resource is available in the printer for the duration of the job, but probably no longer than that. In addition, cached resources are deleted when the server session ends, and when the printer is powered down or re-started. Capturing overcomes the temporary nature of caching. Once an object is captured, it becomes a resident resource in the printer and lasts across server sessions and printer power-off cycles. Resources may be captured by the printer if the resource is made capturable and if the printer has sufficient storage to save the resources. The print server 120 or the control unit 130 may delete such resources (based on a scheme such as a least recently used (LRU) basis) if the storage allocated for capturing is full and the current set of captured resources are not all deemed to be in active usage. However, those skilled in the art will recognize that objects in memory may be deleted according to several criteria, including deleting non-active, least-recently used objects first, deleting the largest objects first or deleting the smallest objects first, so that the capture memory is most effectively utilized. The printer operator may also be given some control over deleting captured resources." (See Aschenbrenner, column 11, lines 5 to 32).

From the foregoing, Aschenbreener clearly contemplates that resources may be cached or "captured" with the captured resources held in storage that is managed on the basis of managing the storage for the captured resources. However, Aschenbrenner, fails to disclose determining processing of a resource, wherein, if the resource is a font or form, the processing of this resource is changed over in a changeover step to processing for adding on a font or form designated by a user and not stored in a destination device and deleting a font or form stored in the device and not designated by the user, or, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding on a color profile designated by the user and not stored in the device without deleting a color profile stored in the device and not designated by the user. According to this feature, it is possible to prevent data error and garbling of characters because the font or form stored in the device is deleted while excepting the font or form designated by the user. Such a technical effect cannot be achieved in a system in accordance with Aschenbrenner.

In light of these deficiencies in Sasaki and Aschenbrenner, Applicant submits that Claim 7 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same. Claims 17 and 18 are directed to methods substantially in accordance with Claim 7. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 17 and 18 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same. Claims 12 and 14 are directed to an apparatus and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 12 and 14 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 19, 20, 24 and 25

Claim 19 is directed to a resource display method for displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. The method comprises a step of acquiring information of a destination device and acquiring types of page description language used for the destination device, a step of determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with the types of page description language acquired in the acquiring step, a step of identifying a color profile, which is loadable into the destination device, based upon the types of color profile determined and color space information of a loadable target color profile and a step of displaying the color profile identified.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Sasaki and Krueger, whether considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the method of Claim 19. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into a destination device in accordance with the types of page description languages supported by and acquired from a destination device.

In contrast to the present invention, Sasaki discloses that "(t)he printer description file means a file in which information about the print property of the printer apparatus 50, i.e., print property information is described. The print property information involves, for example, information indicating types and sizes of applicable print paper, that indicating the number or range of reproducible colors and that indicating types of expandable page description language. Referring now to FIG. 3, an example of the printer description file is shown. Information indicating paper sizes, a font list indicating fonts and the like which can be used by the printer apparatus 50 is described in the printer description file shown therein." (See Ssaki, column 8, lines 36 to 51.)

Therefore, it is clear that Sasaki discloses involving the following information as print property information of the printer apparatus 50: (1) the number or range of reproducible colors; and (2) the types of expandable page description languages. In Sasaki, however, there is no mention of determining the number or range of reproducible colors capable of being loaded into the printer apparatus 50 in accordance with the types of expandable page description languages.

Furthermore, Krueger discloses “(f)or example, consider the selection of the source data in device independent color space. DFE 20 will not provide any source profile queue, page exception or job programming parameters to override the specification of the device independent space within the PDL files, e.g., PostScript, PDF, TIFF or PCL5C files. Furthermore, since the source data for the interpretation of device independent space is always present within the PostScript, PDF, TIFF and PCL5C files or, in the case of PostScript and PDF, as system resources, there is no need for queue defaults either. Therefore, the precedence model for device independent space collapses to always processing the internal" qualification, that is, using the source data specification within the PDL files. (See paragraph [0050] of Krueger.)

Furthermore, Krueger states “FIG. 4 shows a flowchart illustrating the steps in resolving the source profile for a PCL5C file. At step 140, imaging manager 32receives the reconciled attributes for a page from job chooser 24. Next, at step 142, the imaging manager will determine the source color space specified in the CID. If it is device independent, then the appropriate information is extracted from the CID and used (step 144). On the other hand, if it is device dependent, the task-specified ICC profile will be used for the device spaces supported by PCL5C (Gray, RGB and CMY) at step 146.” (See paragraph [0060] of Krueger.)

Clearly, based on the consideration of the foregoing, Krueger merely discloses a description of a plurality of PDL files and processing using a profile. Therefore, even if Sasaki and Krueger are combined, which Applicant does not concede is permissible, the combination still fails to disclose a feature of determining types of color profile capable of being loaded into a destination device in accordance with the types of page description languages acquired from the destination device as neither reference discloses any such feature.

In light of the deficiencies in Sasaki and Krueger as discussed above, Applicant submits that Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 20, 24 and 25 are directed to a method, an apparatus and an apparatus, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 20, 24 and 25 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2737787v1